

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/540,591 | Applicant(s) MERKEN-SCHILLER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner PAUL R. DURAND | Art Unit 3721 | |

All Participants:

(1) PAUL R. DURAND.

(2) Jan Simpson.

Date of Interview: 3 December 2008

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 1300

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Section 103(a)

Claims discussed:

25-27 and 30

Prior art documents discussed:

Hirosue

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

RCE was filed in the case. Examiner amendments overcame the previous rejection, but new reference of Hirosue was found and would be used to reject apparatus claims. The formation of the creases is product specific and is germane to an apparatus claims, but is given patentable weight to the process claims. Hirosue does not teach this process feature, nor does the cited prior art. Applicant agreed to cancel apparatus claims and the examiner will issue the process claims.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/PAUL R. DURAND/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

